

5. (Amended) A liquid crystal display device according to claim 3, wherein the metal reflective film is not formed on a portion of the substrate that is adjacent to a first drawn electrode forming region and a second drawn electrode forming region.

- - REMARKS - -

Claims 1-6 are pending in the application. Claims 1-5 have been rewritten. The changes to the rewritten claims from the previous versions to the rewritten versions are shown in Appendix A (attached hereto as Tab A), with brackets for deleted matter and underlines for added matter. No new matter has been added as a result of this amendment.

In the outstanding Office Action, the claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter of the invention. In particular, the Examiner has objected to the phrase "unformed region" as purportedly contradicting limitations in the same claims calling for the region to be "formed". The rejection is respectfully traversed. The claims have nevertheless been amended to clarify these limitations and eliminate any ambiguity that may have been the basis for the rejections.

In the outstanding Office Action, the claims have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,893,625 to Tamatani et al. ("Tamatani"). The rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are respectfully traversed. The claims have nevertheless been amended further define the invention, to eliminate any ambiguity that may have been the basis for the rejections, and to place this application in condition for allowance.

Independent claims 1-3 are each directed to a liquid crystal display device comprising a pair of substrates with liquid crystal disposed therebetween and a reflective metal film disposed on the surface of one of the substrates. Each of these claims further requires that the reflective metal surface not be formed on a specific portion of the substrate (i.e., and unformed region of the reflective metal surface). With respect to claim 1, the portion of the substrate that does not include the reflective metal surface is adjacent to the injection portion in the sealing material. With respect to claim 2, the portion of the substrate that does not include the reflective metal surface is

adjacent to the drawn electrode region. With respect to claim 3, the portion of the substrate that does not include the reflective metal surface is adjacent to the region in which the second drawn electrode and the display electrode of the other of the substrates are connected to each other on the sealing material.

The present invention, as reflected in the claim limitations discussed above, addresses problems in the prior art associated with liquid crystal displays comprising reflective metal surfaces. As set forth in detail in the background section of the specification for the instant application, the reflective metal surface on such prior art devices typically extended across the entire surface area of the substrate. Because the reflective metal surface was opaque, numerous problems relating to the manufacture and inspection of such devices have been encountered. The present invention overcomes these problems by limiting the coverage of the reflective metal surface to only a portion of the surface of the substrate. In other words, the reflective metal surface is not formed on specific areas of the substrate where, for example, the ability to see through the substrate (i.e., to perform a visual inspection) is necessary or beneficial.

These features and limitations are not disclosed or suggested by the prior art. For example, Tamatani, the only reference relied on by the Examiner, does not even relate to a liquid crystal display device comprising a pair of substrates with liquid crystal disposed therebetween and a reflective metal film disposed on the surface of one of the substrates. In particular, Tamatani does not disclose a reflective metal film disposed on the surface of the device substrate. Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's assertion that the display electrodes (17) disclosed in Tamatani form a "reflective metal surface", as these elements are defined by the specification and claims of the instant application. Moreover, it should be noted that claims 1-3 each require display electrodes as a separate limitation from the reflective metal surface limitation. Thus, it is inappropriate to construe the display electrodes (17) disclosed in Tamatani as disclosing both of these separate and distinct claim limitations.


Of course, since Tamatani does not disclose a reflective metal surface, it also does not disclose those limitations of claims 1-3 that require that the reflective metal surface not be formed on a specific portion of the substrate (i.e., an unformed region of

the reflective metal surface). It is therefore apparent that Tamatani is of little, if any, relevance to the present invention.

Accordingly, independent claims 1-3 are not rendered unpatentable by the prior art. Claims 4-6 are each dependent on claim 3 and are therefore likewise patentable.

Accordingly, Applicants believe that the application is now in condition for allowance and such allowance is now earnestly requested. If for any reason the Examiner is not able to allow the application, he is requested to contact the Applicants' undersigned attorney at (312) 321-4273.

Respectfully submitted,


Michael E. Milz
Registration No. 34,880
Attorney for Applicants

BRINKS HOFER GILSON & LIONE
P.O. BOX 10395
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60610
(312) 321-4200

BEST AVAILABLE COPY